

RESULTS

OF

FIVE YEARS GRIT-ROUGE RULE IN CANADA.

The Contrast between the Professions and Practice of the Grit-Rouge Government.

Mr. Mackenzie entered official life with professions which, had they been honestly carried out, must have won for him at least the respect of political opponents as well as political friends. In a speech which he delivered in St. Catharines in 1870, he laid down this doctrine as that which should govern public men:—"He would never accept office upon any consideration if in doing so he had to abandon the least of the principles he now professed. The man who taught one thing in Opposition and another when he was in power, was a demagogue in whom the people could have no confidence whatever." How has he carried out this doctrine; and how in the light of it is he to be judged by the electors, now that the day of judgment is dawning upon him? Let us answer these questions by a few out of the many facts which might be adduced; and then in the presence of these facts let the electors decide whether he and his friends have not earned the condemnation of being "demagogues in whom the people could have no confidence whatever."

THE COALITION PRINCIPLE.

The people of Canada do not require to be told that the Clear-Grits and Rouges have always opposed the principle of coalitions. Mr. Brown separated from his party as far back as 1851, because he regarded the Hincks-

Rolph Cabinet as a coalition. He rallied his party against the Macnab-Morin Government in 1854 for the same reason. And although ten years afterwards he united with Sir John Macdonald to carry out confederation, his contention was that that was a temporary union, in which parties ceased firing for a time, to resume, on the accomplishment of their object, the old bitterness and the old animosities. In 1867, the party contended that the time for this renewal had arrived, and at the famous Reform Convention which was held in Toronto, before the elections of that year, the anti-coalition principle, as a leading one of the party, was embodied in the following resolution:—

"That Coalitions of opposing political parties for ordinary administrative purposes inevitably result in the abandonment of principle by one or both parties to the compact, the lowering of public morality, lavish public expenditure, and widespread corruption: And while this Convention is thoroughly satisfied that the Reform party has acted in the best interests of the country by sustaining the Government until the Confederation measure was secured—it deems it an imperative duty to declare that the temporary alliance between the Reform and the Conservative parties should now cease, and that no Government will be satisfactory to the people of Upper Canada which is formed and maintained by a Coalition of public men holding opposite political principles."

That resolution had reference to the Government of Ontario, under the leadership of Mr. John Sanfield Macdonald, in which were two Conservatives, Messrs. Cameron and Carling, as well as against

F5012 [1876?] C755 No. 3

the Government of the Dominion, in the Upper Canada section of which were three Liberals, Messrs. Aikens, Macdougall and Howland, the New Brunswick members of which we, Messrs. Tilley and Mitchell, are both Liberals, and one of the Nova Scotia members of which, Mr. Archibald, was a Liberal, making six Liberals in a Cabinet of thirteen, under the leadership of Sir John A. Macdonald. It was urged that the old questions which had separated these parties had been settled by Confederation, that there was really no essential difference of opinion to divide them; but Mr. Blake refused to accept this view, and speaking for his party at a Reform banquet in Toronto in December, 1870, he said:—

"On what ground did these men appeal to the country and conduct the Government of the Province? Oh! that they were good friends; that all party differences had been settled. What a mockery upon an intelligent people is that statement! Is it because one question, however momentous, is settled, that the principles which underlie the current of public opinion, and which are continually to be brought into action, die with the settled question? The question is settled, but the principles are eternal and survive."

That was a declaration that the differences between parties were fundamental, and could not be set aside by the settlement of any leading questions. Mr. Mackenzie in the March subsequently at Hamilton, defined clearly what a coalition was, and how the principle of the Toronto convention would be violated in the forming of a Government. He said:—

"There are only two ways of carrying on a Government; one is by having a Government composed of men who are entirely in harmony on all leading subjects, or by a coalition of different parties who are determined to carry on the administration of affairs in any way they can manage, the only possible way being to bribe a certain number of constituencies. * * * * to procure a good Government, it is necessary that a Premier should strictly select his colleagues from the party whose principles he intends to carry out. To bring into the cabinet the members of an opposing party is Coalition."

At the first opportunity that these Clear Grits had of forming a Government, they violated this principle. That was in the formation of the Ontario Government under Mr. Blake, and with Mr. Mackenzie as his Treasurer, when he took Mr. Scott, who

had always been a Conservative, and who had just been elected as a Conservative, into his Cabinet. In fact, so strong was Mr. Scott in his allegiance to the Conservative party that the *Globe* had described him as of a class which it was hoped would be got rid of. "We trust," it said, "that 'the Scotts are gone, and we hope 'in a few years to see a better generation of politicians grow up.'" Again, referring to the elections for Ottawa in 1867, the *Globe* spoke of Mr. Scott as "John A.'s nominee." And during the first Legislature of Ontario, from 1867 to 1871, out of 221 votes given in the Legislature by Mr. Scott, 208 were given against the Reform party. After the elections he was Mr. Sandfield Macdonald's nominee for Speaker, and was elected to that position, and when he went into Mr. Blake's Government he wrote to Sir John A. Macdonald in relation to it, recognizing him as his leader, and pledging his continued allegiance to him. That was the first violation of this coalition principle, and it showed that the cry of no-coalitions was a mere pretence to be got rid of at the very first opportunity that offered.

When the Government of Sir John Macdonald retired in 1873, and Mr. Mackenzie was called upon to form a Government, he took six gentlemen who had been supporters of the Conservatives into his Cabinet. These were:—

Mr. Scott,	Mr. Ross,
Mr. Cartwright,	Mr. Burpee,
Mr. Coffin,	Mr. A. J. Smith.

We have already seen that Mr. Scott was a Conservative. Mr. Cartwright was not only a Conservative, but a regular blue blooded Tory—an old family compact man—one of the class the Clear Grits are so fond of abusing. Only a year before he accepted office, at the elections of 1872, he was opposed as a Conservative, and was, as a matter of course, abused accordingly. The *Globe* devoted a whole column to the specification of special charges against him, in order to defeat him in his constituency. Here is the record of his "crimes" as given in the *Globe* in 1872:—

1. Mr. Cartwright voted to "reward foul murder" in the North-West.

2. Mr. Cartwright, on the 18th December, 1867, voted "for the adoption of a route for the Intercolonial railway, which he knew to be inimical to the interests of the Dominion."

3. Mr. Cartwright, on the 11th December, 1867, helped by his vote to "subvert the Parliamentary safeguards respecting the control of money."

4. Mr. Cartwright, on the 5th May, 1868, "frustrated economy," having helped to vote down Mr. Holton's motion for the reorganization of the Civil Service.

5. Mr. Cartwright, on the 19th May, 1868, voted down Mr. Blake's motion for the better securing of the Independence of Parliament.

6. Mr. Cartwright, on the 15th May, 1869, "delivered the Treasury into the hands of the most unprincipled of men," by helping to vote down Mr. Mackenzie's motion respecting the Fortification Grant, as follows:—

"That no sums shall be expended on such works until a separate estimate for each work to be constructed shall be submitted to Parliament, and that the amount to be expended in each year shall be voted from time to time."

7. Mr. Cartwright, on the 16th of June, 1867, voted for the "violation of the Constitution" in the matter of the Nova Scotia subsidy.

8. Mr. Cartwright, on the 17th June, 1869, voted for the "corruption of members of the House," having helped to vote down Mr. Holton's motion respecting the payment to Col. Gray for codifying the laws.

9. Mr. Cartwright, on the 19th June, 1869, voted for the "Chantry Island job."

10. Mr. Cartwright, on the 10th May, 1870, voted for the Manitoba Act, thereby becoming a party to "one of the most iniquitous and blundering of measures."

11. Mr. Cartwright, on the 28th February, 1871, voted against the abolition of Dual Representation.

12. Lastly, Mr. Cartwright, on the 1st June, 1872, voted for the "abdication by Parliament of its constitutional right to control the public expenditure on the Pacific Railway," having helped to vote down a motion by Mr. E. B. Wood respecting the money asked by the Govern-

ment for the construction of the Pacific Railway, as follows:—

"That the \$30,000,000 and 50,000,000 acres of land be only disposed of by specific annual votes of Parliament from time to time a- shall seem to Parliament right and proper so that Parliament shall not be divested of its most important constitutional function, viz., control over the public expenditure of the country."

And yet the man with all these crimes upon his head, who in 1872 was considered unfit, because of them, to represent a constituency as an independent member of Parliament, was in 1873 taken into the Government by Mr. Mackenzie as his Finance Minister, and has been ever since, as an act of gratitude and submission, abusing his old political friends, for these very votes which he had himself joined them in giving.

Messrs. Coffin, Ross, Burpee, and Smith were all elected in 1872 as supporters of the Government of Sir John A. Macdonald. Mr. Smith, in his address to his electors, was most emphatic on that point. He said:—"Gentlemen, five years ago you sent me to the Parliament of our country with all my prepossessions in favor of the Reform party. Having carefully watched both sides, I have been giving my support to the Liberal-Conservative party, AND I TELL YOU AS AN HONEST MAN, THAT I F YOU CHOOSE ME AS YOUR REPRESENTATIVE AGAIN IT MUST BE ON THE UNDERSTANDING THAT I AM STILL TO SUPPORT THAT PARTY." So strong were these four gentlemen as supporters of the Government that on the celebrated vote on Mr. Huntington's charges against the late Government, they all voted with Sir John Macdonald. But, say the Grit apologists for the coalition principle which they formerly condemned so strongly, these men quarrelled with the Government on the subject of the Pacific scandal. Suppose that is admitted. Did it justify them taking office with their political opponents, or the offer of office to them by the great opponent of coalitions, as necessarily moral and corrupt? If it did, then what becomes of Mr. Blake's magnificent rhodomandate? "Is it because one question, "however momentous, is settled, "that the principles which un-

3028301

"derlie the current of public opinion, " and which are continually to be brought "into action, die with the settled question? " The question is settled, but the principles are eternal and survive." Surely the same principle should apply in relation to a quarrel with the leader of a party on one question. That question may cause an estrangement between the leader and the follower; but it cannot justify the latter in being accepted as a leader in the ranks of the opposite party. The quarrel has occurred, "but the principles are eternal and survive." The present Government is, therefore, as much a coalition Government as were any of those condemned by Mr. Mackenzie and his friends on that ground, and his own words are fairly applicable to him, "that the man who taught one thing in opposition and another when he was in power, was a demagogue in whom the people could have no confidence whatever."

That was the position at the formation of the Cabinet. Mr. Mackenzie has certainly not improved since. His conduct in taking Mr. Cauchon into the Cabinet, was not only a violation of the anti-coalition principle of which he used to talk so much; it was a declaration that even the worst men in the Conservative party, the men who have been discredited by it, will be taken up by those Grit-Rouges, if their party interests can be advantaged by it. Mr. Blake, in denouncing the Sandfield Macdonald Government in 1870, laid down a principle which is certainly valuable, but which was terribly violated when Mr. Cauchon was taken into the Cabinet. Referring to Mr. Macdonald, he said: "But he has formed an alliance with the men who denounced him as unworthy of public confidence and almost of private associations in days gone by." And then having enumerated some of the charges which had been made against Mr. Macdonald, all of which had relation simply to an alleged misuse of patronage to keep his party in power, and not to any act done for his own personal advantage, Mr. Blake went on: "I would like to know how Mr. Macdonald, the sinner of 1864, is the saint of to-day. None of these charges have been retracted, and are yet hanging over his head. So much

"with reference to the antecedents of the Administration. I ask now what you could expect from such a union, what progeny from such an unnatural alliance?" That was the doctrine then, that a man once charged with political wrong-doing by a party, cannot afterwards act with that party without dis honour to both, unless the charge has been retracted. In the case of Mr. Cauchon, he had been abused as a public man for the grossest maladministration of the departments over which he presided. But he had been accused of a worse crime than this, of prostituting his public position to his own private gain. The *Globe* of the 6th December, 1872, said of him:—

"It (the report of the Beauport Committee) tells its own story, and that is a very disgraceful one. A job is bad enough in any case, but a job at the expense of the poor unfortunates who have lost their reason is especially detestable."

And on the 9th December, 1872:—

"The Beauport job is rank and smells to Heaven.

"That Cauchon has been proved guilty of jobbery, and of defiantly breaking the law for years, is, we should think, not doubted by any sane man."

And on the 26th December, 1872:—

"M. Cauchon comes back, apparently, to brazen out the whole of his iniquities, and the Ministry (of Quebec), with that helpless want of self-respect which they have all along shown, are eager to override all ordinary forms and requirements for the privilege of again saluting their 'honorable friend' as member for Montmorency. Some men, even in their degradation, have some respect for themselves, but M. Chauveau and his friends seem to have lost theirs, if they ever had it."

Mr. Penny, a Senator and a leading Reformer of Quebec, wrote in his newspaper, the *Montreal Herald* of the 18th December, 1872:—

"Scandalous as this affair is in its barest outline, it is made infinitely worse by its attendant circumstances. It is worse because this villainous bargain was made with a man (M. Cauchon) holding no less honorable a position than the Presidency of the Senate; worse because the materials out of which the job was affected were those who suffer from the saddest infirmity to which human nature is liable, because what was bought and sold was the power of squeezing the highest possible profit out of economies, exercised at the cost of the most helpless of God's creatures. It is quite safe to say that if this were a matter of life and death in the Criminal Court, the evidence of M. Cauchon—not to go a step too far, we do not include the Ministry in the scope of this sentence—would be sufficient to hang him."

And Senator Hector Fabre, another leading Liberal, wrote in his newspaper, *L'Evenement*, of the same date :

" Mr. Cauchon will be able, perhaps, to secure, as he announces, his re-election for Montmorency, but he will never recover from the blow he has just received. The confession of culpability which has lately been extracted from him will be as a weight upon him for evermore. It is now impossible that he should ever be Lieut.-Governor or Local Prime Minister, for the too-lengthened series of his double dealings has come to a close. He goes forth this day from the Local Chamber despised and spat upon, only soon to withdraw from public life, crushed and disgraced. It is the commencement of capital punishment which honest people have been demanding for so long a time past."

Those were hard words; how have they been fulfilled? This same Mr. Cauchon, three years afterwards, without one of these expressions having been retracted, was made, not, it is true, a local Prime Minister, but was brought into Mr. Mackenzie's Cabinet as the leader of the Rouge party which had thus abused him, and as President of the Council for the Dominion! Were the statements made in relation to Mr. Cauchon true or untrue? If true, and he had to resign his seat in the Legislature of Quebec because of them, what shall we say of a party which, in violation of their anti-coalition pledges, made him a Minister, and afterwards imposed him as Lieutenant-Governor on one of the Provinces of the Dominion? If it be contended that the charges were untrue or exaggerated, what shall we say of a party that could thus slander a public man? As we have said, they have not been retracted; it is not pretended that they are untrue, and under the circumstances we may well ask, in the language of Mr. Blake, "what could you expect from such a union, what progeny from such an unnatural alliance?" So much for the way in which the Grits in office have carried out their principle in relation to the immorality of coalitions, which they professed in opposition

NUMBER OF MINISTERS.

The electors of Canada do not need to be told that the Grit-Rouge party at the time of confederation, and since until they took office, were professedly opposed to a Cabinet of thirteen Ministers. In the very first session of the Parliament

of Canada, Mr. Blake challenged the wisdom of having so many Ministers, and with that peculiar faculty which he has shown since he entered public life, of condemning himself in advance, denounced the number, irrespective of the mere question of economy. With him it was the extent of executive influence in Parliament which was the danger, and he pronounced himself strongly, amid the admiring plaudits of the whole party, against the right of the executive to appoint ministers, not specifically named by the law, even if those ministers should consent to act without salary. He said :

" It is necessary to prevent, by stringent enactments, the possibility on the part of the Crown of filling the House with more than the necessary number of executive officers. It is wrong to argue that because a member of the Executive does not receive a direct salary from the Crown, therefore he can be added to the Executive Council with impunity. If that argument were correct, any number of such offices might be created, and the whole House controlled by placemen who nominally are servants of the Crown!"

Later, in October 1870, Mr. Mackenzie in a speech delivered by him in London, laid down the Grit-Rouge doctrine in relation to the Cabinet of the Dominion in these words :—

" While the finances of the Province were formerly administered by one Minister, we have now four. One, who is supreme, is Hincks; the other, Tilley, is Minister of Customs; Morris, is Minister of Inland Revenue, and another gentleman is Receiver-General. Now, what I contend for is, that there is no necessity for this amplification of the Cabinet. There is no necessity for a Cabinet of thirteen! The United States have a population of forty millions of vast territory and vast concerns to manage—still they get along with seven Ministers, and one secretary of the Treasury conducts all the financial affairs."

In November 1873, three years after this strong declaration against the necessity "for a Cabinet of thirteen," Mr. Mackenzie was called upon to form a Government. How did he carry out his principles? By reducing the number of Cabinet Ministers? Not a bit of it. He formed his Cabinet with fourteen members, Mr. Blake, in his own person, violating his own statement against the Crown "filling the House with more than the necessary executive officers" even although "a member of the executive does not receive a direct salary from the Crown," by becoming a Minister with-

out salary, and in excess of the number allowed by law! And he has ever since continued with the thirteen members in his cabinet. The finances of the Dominion continue to be administered by four Ministers, in spite of Mr. Mackenzie's condemnation of that state of things. Last season, it is true, there was a bill introduced to abolish the office of Receiver-General; but in its place it was proposed to add an Attorney-General, an office about as useful as a fifth wheel to a coach, unless it was to give another position to one of the lawyers in Parliament. The Senate amended the bill by striking out the clause creating the new office, that of Attorney General, and the Ministers abandoned it in consequence. After all their denunciations of a cabinet of thirteen, they actually refused to abolish one of the offices which they had declared to be useless, unless they were permitted, at the same time, to create another office, which was certainly quite as useless, in order that the cabinet of thirteen might be maintained!

PURITY AT ELECTIONS.

In nothing have the pretensions of the present Government and the party which supports it been more extravagant than in their claim that they were opposed to electoral corruption, and anxious to prevent the use of money in bribing electors. It is not necessary to quote their repeated statements to that effect. They formed, in fact, the stock in trade of the party. What has been their record in this respect? In the publication of what is known as the "big push letter," we have a proof that at the very time they were most loud in their denunciations of bribery they were themselves revelling in corruption. It is worth while reprinting the big push letter, as an example of the shameless manner in which the corruption fund was solicited, and the purposes for which it was intended to be used. Here is the substance of it:—

"TORONTO, August 15th, 1872.
"Hon. JOHN SIMPSON,
"Pres'd't Ontario Bank.

"MY DEAR SIR.—The fight goes bravely on. * * * We have expended our strength in aiding outlying counties and helping our city candidates. But a BIG PUSH has to be made on Saturday and Monday for the East

and West divisions. * * * We therefore make our GRAND STAND on Saturday. There are but half a dozen people that can COME DOWN HANDSOMELY, and we have done all we possibly can do, and we have to ask a few outsiders to aid us. WILL YOU BE ONE? I have been urged to write you, and comply accordingly. Things look well all over the Province. * * * Things look bright in Quebec!

"Faithfully yours,

"GEORGE BROWN."

It has been pretended that this money was only required for the ordinary legal expenses of the election. But the electors will readily see that that is an absurd pretension. The ordinary legal expenses of an election are not incurred on the day before the voting and on the day of voting. When large sums of money are required on those days, it is for corrupt purposes; and under these circumstances, the opinion of Mr. Justice Wilson on this letter will be accepted as a correct opinion. The learned Judge said:—"It is a letter written for corrupt purposes, to interfere with the freedom of elections. "It is an invitation to the recipient as 'one, with some others and the writer, 'to concur in committing bribery and 'corruption at the polls." That was at the elections of 1872, and everything concurs to show that what was done in Toronto was done throughout the Dominion.

In 1874, at the general elections, the same wholesale corruption prevailed, and that in spite of the fact that the special issue of that election, according to Grit-Rouge orators, was the question of electoral purity. The Conservative Government had passed an act for the trial of controverted elections by the Courts, and the result was the exposures which have startled and disgusted the public. Of the Ministerialists elected no less than thirty have been unseated by the Courts for corrupt practices by themselves or by their agents, as follows:—

Shibley,	Cushing,
Jodoin,	Tremblay,
Mackay,	Macdonald (Cornwall),
McGregor,	McNab,
Chisholm,	Wood,
Irving,	Cameron (S. Huron),
Norris,	Walker,
Devlin,	Mackenzie (Montreal),
Coupland,	Stuart,
Biggar,	Kerr,

Murray,	Macdougall (S. Renf'w),
Aylmer,	Cook,
Wilkes,	O'Donohue,
Prevost,	McLennan,
Higinbotham,	Dymond.

The extent of corruption practised in many of these cases was not exposed, because in order to avoid exposure the members went through the form of "throwing up the sponge," as it was popularly called. But in some cases we have the proof in a form that cannot well be disputed. Here, for instance, is Mr. Cook's confession of how he did it, the statements being from his own evidence in his election trial in 1874 :—

"In the spring of 1871 I canvassed the constituency for one month or six weeks; in 1872 I canvassed the constituency for a similar length of time. Speaking from memory, the expenses of my canvass in 1871 would reach about \$10,000; it might amount to \$13,000, for I do not charge my mind with \$2,000 or \$3,000 in election matters. I have been examining my accounts for election expenses in 1872, and making a rough estimate I place them at \$13,000 to \$15,000. They certainly did not exceed the latter sum. That amount I paid myself. I do not know anything about sums paid by my friends. In 1873 the expenditures were much smaller, because I thought I would have the sympathy of the people in consequence of my expenditures in 1872, and that my opponent would have to carry the Pacific scandal on his back."

Here is a confession of an expenditure of \$25,000 in corrupting the electors of one constituency in the interests of the principle of purity of elections! What was actually spent may be inferred from the confession of this eminent star in the Clear Grit firmament, that he does not charge his memory with such paltry sums as two or three thousand dollars when dealing with election expenditure. It is hardly necessary to say that with such a record, perhaps on account of it, Mr. Cook has been chosen Ministerial standard bearer for his county at the coming election.

Then we have "Major" Walker, of London. As far as could be ascertained by the evidence, some \$25,000 was spent in his case, in order to prove to the electors of London the importance of electoral purity. Here is what Mr. Justice Gwynne thought of this case :—

"We can as readily believe it is possible for the respondent to have been immersed in the lake and to have been taken out dry as that the acts of bribery which the evidence discloses to have been committed on his behalf,

almost under his eyes, in his daily path, with means of corruption proceeding from his own headquarters, and from the hand of his confidential agent, could have been committed otherwise than with his knowledge and consent. * * * It is my opinion that the arrangements or undertaking, tacit or express, between the parties was that the respondent should be kept in ignorance of the particular separate and distinct acts of bribery committed, while he was aware, as he could not but be, upon rational principles, that corruption and wickedness upon a most extensive scale were practised around him on his behalf and in his sole interest."

As Major Walker had sworn that he knew nothing about these expenditures, these words of the learned Judge look very like a charge of deliberate perjury against that gallant gentleman. He has since been a shining light among the "purists" of the West, in personal attendance upon Mr. Mackenzie in his political perambulations, and he is now the standard-bearer of the party, in the interests of purity of elections, at the coming election for London. Here in two constituencies alone, we have the proof of a large expenditure, larger by at least ten thousand dollars, than Sir John Macdonald obtained in 1872 from Sir Hugh Allan for the whole eighty-six Ontario constituencies!

In South Huron Mr. M. C. Cameron admitted in his evidence that he had paid from \$10,000 to \$14,000 in order to win that County in the interests of purity of elections. The Honble Malcolm Cameron, in that remarkable confession which he made before his death, stated that he had spent \$6,000 in contesting Russell, the expenditure "having had a good effect in subsequently securing that constituency to the Reformers," and he complained that his party had not reimbursed him, as they promised to do, showing that the corruption was not a personal but a party affair. The Honble Mr. Ross, the Minister of Militia at the time, according to correspondence recently made public, admitted as follows :—"I placed with my committee a certain amount of money to relieve honest, "worthy men." In the Champlain election, it was proved that Mr. Laflamme, the present Minister of Justice, was the manager of a corruption fund to which one gentleman, Mr. Jodoin, who was unseated and disqualified, had contributed twenty thousand dollars.

These are simply specimen bricks of the wholesale corruption resorted to by the Grit-Rouge combination, in the interests of purity of elections. They afford a striking illustration of the difference between the professions and practices of Mr. Mackenzie and his friends.

CONNECTION OF DOMINION AND LOCAL POLITICS.

These is only one more point that it is necessary to refer to under the general head of the differences between the professions and acts of the Ministerialists, and that has relation to their pretension in former times that there should be a complete severance between the Federal and local Governments. When the Blake-Mackenzie Government was formed in Ontario, Mr. Blake in his speech announcing the policy of the Government, stated his complaint against the former Government as follows :—

" My friends and myself have for the past four years claimed that the late Administration was formed upon the principle and the understanding that it and the Government of the Dominion should work together—play into one another's hands—that they should be allies."

And then he pointed out the principle upon which the Government was formed :—

" My friends and myself thought, and my Administration now thinks that such an arrangement is injurious to the well-being of Confederation, calculated to create difficulties which might be avoided, and that there should exist no other attitude on the part of the Provincial Government towards the Government of the Dominion than one of neutrality, that each Government should be absolutely independent in the management of its own affairs. We believe that the Government of the Province ought not to assume a position of either alliance or hostility towards the Government of the Dominion."

We might quote from speeches of others, Mr. Mackenzie for instance, in confirmation of the statement that that was the fixed policy of the Clear Grits. But it is only necessary to quote one passage from the *Globe* to show what were the evidences upon which they charged

against the Conservatives an improper alliance between the Local and Federal Governments—" We are now in a position to declare that the two Macdonalds have arrived at an understanding in reference to the coming campaign. They are to hunt in couples and mutually to seek each other's well-being and success."

This hunting in couples and mutually seeking each other's well-being and success, on the part of the Dominion and local Governments was the alliance to which the Clear Grits pledged themselves to put an end. They were no sooner in office than they began to violate this principle. We had the remarkable letter from Mr. D. A. Macdonald, the Postmaster-General, to Mr. Mowat, in which he said, "I am satisfied that you can depend upon the 'eastern section supporting you to a man. " WE ARE ALL DOING THE VERY " BEST WE CAN FOR YOU." At every one of the meetings held by Mr. Mackenzie throughout the country, members of the local Government of Ontario have stood on the same platform, " hunting in couples with him," and mutually seeking each other's well-being and success. The recent crisis in Quebec had no other object than that of getting the Local Government into the hands of the Rouges, for the sake of the influence it would give in the coming elections for the House of Commons. And since the local elections, judgeships, which are in the exclusive gift of the Dominion Government, have been offered to members of the Legislative Assembly in Quebec to induce them to sustain the Joly Government. But it is the old story of the wrong ox being gored. An alliance between the Federal and local Governments, in the interests of the Conservatives, is a thing to be condemned, as destructive of the working of the Federal principle ; such an alliance in the interests of the Grits and Rouges, is a thing not only to be commended, but to be brought about by the most violent measures.